

Accordingly, in light of Applicant's amendments to the drawings (Fig. 2) and to the specification, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the drawings. If further changes or discussion regarding the drawings is needed, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney for such changes/discussion.

**REMARKS – Rejections to the Claims****Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-16, and 18-21 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent claims. Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 13-15, and 18-20 have been amended, claims 3, 10, and 17 have been canceled, and no claims have been added.

**Examiner Interview**

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner Interview conducted between Applicant's undersigned attorney and Examiner Chen on February 27, 2007. In particular, Applicant's attorney and Examiner Chen discussed the drawing objection noted in the Office Action requesting that one of Applicant's drawings be noted as "prior art." Applicant's attorney explained that, while the drawing itself is substantially similar to an IEEE drawing, the text describing the drawing is directed at Applicant's invention and, therefore, is not prior art. Applicant agreed to note the drawing as an "overview" on both the drawing and in the specification.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner noted that original dependent claims 3-6, 10, 13, 14, and 17-20 were deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has incorporated the limitations of claims 3, 10, and 17 into their respective independent claims (1, 8, and 15), and has canceled claims 3, 10, and 17 in this Response. Accordingly, claims 1, 8, and 15, as amended, include limitations deemed allowable in the Office Action.

**Objections to the Specification**

The specification was objected to because of an informality in that it contained a hyperlink. The specification has been amended and the hyperlink has been removed. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection in light of Applicant's amendment.

**Claim Rejections - Alleged Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 11, 12, 15, 16, and 21 were rejected as allegedly being anticipated, and therefore unpatentable, over U.S. Patent No. 6,934,898 to Goff. In light of Applicant's amendments to the independent claims incorporating limitations found to be allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Applicant's independent claims. Likewise, the remaining dependent claims each depend, directly or indirectly, on an allowable independent claim and, therefore, are allowable for at least the same reasons that the independent claims are allowable.

**Conclusion**

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicant that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests an early allowance of such claims.

Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicant's attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Joseph T. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 44,383/

Joseph T. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 44,383

Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen

Attorneys for Applicant

Telephone: (512) 301-6738

Facsimile: (512) 301-6742